

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 04877 252311Z

63

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDA-05 BIB-01

ERDE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00 /078 W

----- 051490

O R 252016Z JUN 75

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4069

INFO SECDEF

USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION TWO OF TWO GENEVA 4877

FOR EUR/RPM

MAY BE APPROPRIATE, AS A CONTRIBUTION TO CONFIDENCE-BUILDING AND AT THE DISCRETION OF THE STATE OR STATES INVOLVED, FOR NOTIFICATION TO BE GIVEN OF OTHER MILITARY MANEUVERS.

(C) EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS

--THE PARTICIPATING STATES WILL INVITE OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES, VOLUNTARILY AND ON A BILATERAL BASIS, IN A SPIRIT OF RECIPROCITY AND GOODWILL TOWARDS ALL PARTICIPATING STATES, TO SEND OBSERVERS TO ATTEND MILITARY MANEUVERS.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 04877 252311Z

--THE INVITING STATE WILL DETERMINE IN EACH CASE

THE NUMBER OF OBSERVERS, THE PROCEDURES AND CONDITIONS OF THEIR PARTICIPATION, AND GIVE OTHER INFORMATION WHICH IT MAY CONSIDER USEFUL. IT WILL PROVIDE APPROPRIATE FACILITIES AND HOSPITALITY.

--THE INVITATION WILL BE GIVEN AS FAR AHEAD AS IS CONVENIENTLY POSSIBLE THROUGH USUAL DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS.

(D) PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS

--IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HELSINKI CONSULTATIONS, THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE STUDIED THE QUESTION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS.

--THEY RECOGNIZE THAT NOTIFICATION OF MILITARY MOVEMENTS WOULD CONTRIBUTE TO STRENGTHENING CONFIDENCE AND INCREASING STABILITY AND SECURITY.

--THE PARTICIPATING STATES HAVE CONCLUDED THAT AS A CONTRIBUTION TO THEIR COMMON OBJECTIVES OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING IN EUROPE, THEY MAY, AT THEIR OWN DISCRETION PROVIDE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF THEIR MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS. (12)

(E) OTHER CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

--HAVING CONSIDERED OTHER PROPOSALS RELATING TO STRENGTHENING CONFIDENCE AND INCREASING SECURITY AND STABILITY IN EUROPE, AND RECOGNIZING THAT THERE ARE OTHER MEANS BY WHICH THESE COMMON OBJECTIVES CAN BE PROMOTED, THE PARTICIPATING STATES WILL:

--WITH DUE REGARD TO RECIPROCITY AND WITH A VIEW TO BETTER MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING, PROMOTE EXCHANGES BY INVITATION AMONG THEIR MILITARY PERSONNEL, INCLUDING VISITS BY MILITARY DELEGATIONS; (13)

EFFORTS AIMED AT PROMOTING DETENTE AND DISARMAMENT

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 04877 252311Z

(...) (14) END TEXT.

BEGIN FOOTNOTES.

1. ALTHOUGH NO PROPOSED TITLE HAS BEEN INCLUDED, BECAUSE OF CONTINUING DISCUSSION OF THIS ISSUE WITHIN ALLIED CAUCUS, UK WILL MAKE CLEAR THAT ALLIES ARE AGREED THAT THERE SHOULD BE A TITLE FOR FINAL CBM DOCUMENT.

2. CHANGE FROM TEXT IN REFTEL (A) REPRESENTS DUTCH PROPOSAL, INTENDED TO ELIMINATE WORDS "POLITICAL DETENTE". OTHER ALLIES DID NOT OBJECT.

3. ALTHOUGH UK PROPOSAL STILL INCLUDES THE WORD "THEREFORE", WHICH SOVIETS OPPOSE, UK WILL INDICATE WILLINGNESS TO NEGOTIATE AN AMENDMENT TO THIS PREAMBULAR CLAUSE.

4. STRONG ALLIED CONSENSUS DEVELOPED FOR "DECLARATION" WHICH MANY ALLIES SAW AS A MEANS TO GIVE CBM DOCUMENT THE SAME STATUS AS DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES. FOR SAME REASON, ALLIES PREFERRED SINGULAR RATHER THAN PLURAL VERSION OF THE WORD. SEVERAL REPS WERE SKEPTICAL THAT SOVIETS WOULD ACCEPT "DECLARATION" BUT US DEL BELIEVES SOVIETS WILL PREFER IT TO "RESOLUTIONS" OR "RESOLUTION" BECAUSE RUSSIAN TRANSLATION CARRIES LESS FORCE.

5. SEE GENEVA 4848 AND GENEVA 4871 FOR EXPLANATION OF PRECEDING THREE OPERATIVE PARAGRAPHS. PHRASE "THROUGH USUAL DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS" WAS DISCUSSED IN SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUNE 24-25, AND MAY BE MODIFIED TO COVER CIRCUMSTANCES OF PARTICIPATING STATES THAT DO NOT HAVE BILATERAL DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS.

6. DESPITE US WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT TURKISH PROPOSAL FOR AMPHIBIOUS/AIRBORNE/SUB-THRESHOLD, AS AUTHORIZED REF (B) ON CONDITIONS PROPOSED REF (A), UK DECLINED TO INCLUDE TURKISH PROPOSAL IN TEXT, ON GROUNDS THAT SOVIETS HAD ALREADY MADE CLEAR THAT IT WAS NOT NEGOTIABLE. OTHER ALLIES SUPPORTED THE UK. TURKS RESERVED OPTION TO INTRODUCE/ UNILATERAL PROPOSAL FORMALLY IN A SUBSEQUENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 GENEVA 04877 252311Z

7. SINCE TEXT IN PARAS BEFORE THIS ONE NOW MAKES SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO COMBINED MANEUVERS, SEVERAL ALLIES BELIEVED THAT WORDS "AS APPLICABLE" SHOULD BE REPLACED BY "IN THE CASE OF COMBINED MANEUVERS". UK PREFERRED NOT TO CHANGE MENTALLY REGISTERED TEXT FOR THE TIMEBEING, BUT ALLIES GENERALLY AGREED THAT CHANGE WOULD BE LOGICAL AND DESIRABLE AND COULD BE INTRODUCED LATER.

8. AFTER US READ INSTRUCTIONS ON USE OF WORD "FRONTIER", NUMBER OF ALLIES TOOK EXCEPTION TO US INTERPRETATION. SEVERAL REPS WHO ALSO SERVE IN COMMITTEE I (PRINCIPLES) CLAIMED THERE WAS CLEAR UNDERSTANDING ON MEANING OF "FRONTIERS" IN OTHER CONTEXTS (I.E., IN PRINCIPLE OF INVIOABILITY OF FRONTIERS), AND THAT TERM HAD BEEN AGREED BY ALL CSCE PARTICIPANTS

TO INCLUDE BOTH LAND AND SEA BORDERS. MOREOVER, SOVIETS HAD AGREED THAT WORD HAD SAME MEANING FOR CBM PURPOSES. IT WAS ALSO POINTED OUT THAT USAGE OF "FRONTIERS" HAS BEEN TAKEN TO MEAN OUTER LIMITS OF TERRITORIAL WATERS, WITH RESULT THAT ZONE OF APPLICATION OF CBMS IN USSR AND TURKEY WOULD PRESUMABLY BE MEASURED FROM THESE LIMITS, RATHER THAN FROM COAST LINE. US REP SAID THAT MOST IMPORTANT POINT FOR THE MOMENT WAS ACHIEVING AGREEMENT ON SUBSTANCE OF WHERE MANEUVER CBM WOULD APPLY, AND THAT PRECISE WORDING COULD BE SETTLED IN FUTURE DISCUSSIONS.

9. UK TEXT HERE IS SOMEWHAT OVERTAKEN BY SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSION ON JUNE 25, BUT FURTHER CHANGES PROPOSED IN COMMITTEE ARE IN ACCORD WITH STANDING US GUIDANCE.

10. MINOR CHANGES FROM TEXT IN REF (A) WERE INTRODUCED TO SATISFY TURKS ON THEIR PROPOSALS FOR ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.

1. SAME AS FOOTNOTE 9.

12. US REP MADE CLEAR THAT US SUPPORT FOR UK PACKAGE WAS CONDITIONAL ON MOVEMENTS TEXT NOT BEING PRESENTED TO SOVIETS ON A "TAKE IT OR LEAVE IT" BASIS. ALLIES WELCOMED US WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT PACKAGE AND DID NOT OBJECT TO THIS CONDITION.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 GENEVA 04877 252311Z

13. UK HAS DROPPED PARAGRAPH WHICH FOLLOWED THIS ONE IN REF (A) VERSION, ON UNDERSTANDING THAT NEUTRALS, IN PARTICULAR SWEDEN, WILL INTRODUCE TEXT IF THEY WISH TO PURSUE CBM ON PUBLICATION OF DEFENSE SPENDING FIGURES.

14. TEXT FOR HELSINKI PARAGRAPHS 22 AND 24 HAS BEEN OMITTED, SINCE THIS IS NOW ONCE AGAIN UNDER ACTIVE NEGOTIATION IN SMALL DRAFTING GROUP. US PROPOSAL IN CAUCUS TO INTRODUCE "ARMS CONTROL" AND BEFORE "DISARMAMENT" MET STANDING FRENCH OBJECTION, AND US REP DID NOT PRESS POINT IN VIEW OF EARLIER US ACQUIESCEANCE WITH MENTALLY REGISTERED TEXTS IN WHICH THESE WORDS DO NOT APPEAR.DALE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 25 JUN 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975GENEVA04877
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: RR
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750614/aaaaammu.tel
Line Count: 214
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 10 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <10 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <22 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: n/a
TAGS: n/a
To: SECSTATE WASHDC NATO MOSCOW MBFR VIENNA LONDON ANKARA BONN PARIS
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006